

**Remarks**

Claim 1 has been amended in response to the Office Action. Claims 2, 4, 7, and 8 have been cancelled. Claim 5 has been amended to change its dependency in view of the cancellation of Claim 4. New claims 11-15 have been added to more precisely claim Applicants' invention. Applicants assert that the amendments raise no issue of new matter. Basis for the amendments may be found in the specification at: page 6, paragraphs ab), ad), ag), ah), and ai); page 7, paragraph an); page 8, paragraph cj); page 11, paragraph fo); and page 113, EXAMPLE 365. Entry of the amendments and allowance of the claims in view of the amendments and the following discussion are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has required restriction under 35 U.S.C. §§ 121 and 372 because the claims allegedly are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Although Applicants believe that this restriction requirement is improper, Applicants elect the invention of Group I, drawn to compounds where  $-(CH_2)_m-W-X-Y-R-$ , taken together with the atoms to which they are attached, form a 1,4-diazepine ring. The claims have been amended to limit their scope to compounds falling within Group I. Applicants also elect the species of EXAMPLE 365 for purposes of examination. Allowance of the claims in view of the election and amendments is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert D. Titus/

Robert D. Titus  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,206  
Phone: 317-277-3729

Eli Lilly and Company  
Patent Division  
P.O. Box 6288  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6288

June 7, 2007